| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | 10/811,761 | WOBBROCK ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | SATH V. PERUNGAVOOR | 2624 |
| All Participants: Status of Application: Response to Non-final | | |
| (1) <u>SATH V. PERUNGAVOOR</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Mr. Edward L. Pencoske (Reg. No. 29,688). | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: <u>14 January 2010</u> | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: N/A | | |
| Claims discussed: All | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: N/A | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Examiner suggested claim amendments that would place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant's representative agreed. See Examiner's Amendment Claims. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| /Sath V Perungavoor/ | | |
| Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624 | (Applicant/Applicant's Representat | ive Signature – if appropriate) |